

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

19 April 1990

AM 10:00 CONVENE, Pension Building, Suite 312, Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

15 March 1990

B. Dates of next meetings:

17 May 1990

21 June 1990

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, U.S. Mint

CFA 19/Apr/90-10, Bicentennial of the United States
Coast Guard medal. Design.

B. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 19/Apr/90-1, Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Memorial, West Potomac Park. Review of
approved design. (Previous: CFA 20/Sept/79-15.)
2. CFA 19/Apr/90-2, Vietnam Veterans Memorial.
Memorial to honor women of the U.S. Armed Forces
who served in Vietnam. Site selection.
(Previous: CFA 22/Oct/87-1.)
3. CFA 19/Apr/90-11, Proposed sculpture, Res 58, 21st
Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 19 April 1990

C. Department of the Air Force

CFA 19/Apr/90-3, Bolling Air Force Base. Repair and alterations to the Potomac River embankment.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 90-103, 3301 K Street, N. W.
Proposed residential - commercial office complex. Revised concept design.

b. Appendix II.

E. Department of State, International Center

CFA 19/Apr/90-4, Egyptian Embassy. Preliminary design for new Chancery.

F. Department of the Army, Military District of Washington, Fort Myer

CFA 19/Apr/90-5, Six NCO Family Housing Units. New construction, Ft. Myer, Virginia. Revised design and site development. (Previous: CFA 18/Jan/90-5.)

G. Department of Agriculture

CFA 19/Apr/90-6, Child Development Center playground, Auditors Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, N. W. Design.

H. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park

CFA 19/Apr/90-7, Amazonia/Aquatic Habitats Exhibit. Final design.
(Previous: CFA 16/Jun/88-3, CFA 21/Sep/89-2.)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS, continued, 19 April 1990

I. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 19/Apr/90-8, 633 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Wall mural. Concept design.

J. Freer Gallery

CFA 19/Apr/90-9, Tour of Freer Gallery and inspection
of proposed acquisitions.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR - 19 APRIL 1990

START: 8:00 AM
Suite 312, Pension Building, 401 F Street, N. W.

DEPART: Pension Building to:

1. Vietnam Memorial (memorial near plaza)
2. FDR Memorial (Tidal Basin, West Potomac Park)
3. Ft. Myer (6 NCO houses)
4. Auditors Building (north side 14th & Independence)

Members Present:

J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Joan Abrahamson
Adele Chatfield-Taylor
George Hartman
Robert Peck
Neil Porterfield

Staff Present:

Donald Myer

Charles Atherton and
Sue Kohler (FDR & VVM)

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 90-92	3800 14th Street, N.W. William C. Smith & Co., Inc. Twin Oaks Apartments	Alterations and fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations including new unpainted brick fence, security gate and replacement windows. Request material sample of brick.

S.L. 90-94	1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Warner Theatre Assoc. Ltd. Part. Warner Theatre	Renovation to theatre - permit
------------	--	--------------------------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed renovation to theatre structure and alterations to exterior as shown in working drawings which comply with previously approved concept submissions. See previous Actions. (S.L. 89-206 and S.L. 89-51.)

S.L. 90-114	6727 16th Street, N.W. Marion Mann Single family dwelling	New building - permit
-------------	---	--------------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new single family dwelling.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 90-89	450 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.	New door
HPA. 90-386	Congressman T. Cass Ballenger Residence	surround - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed door surround.

S.L. 90-99	2033 Waterside Drive, N.W.	Alterations -
HPA. 90-460	Nina Shapiro Residence	revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations.

S.L. 90-101	2301 N Street, N.W.	Canopy
	Boston Properties Emerson House	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed modifications to previously approved design which include entrance canopy.

S.L. 90-102	201 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E.	Alterations,
HPA. 90-466	American Security Bank	sign, awning, and new ATM machine - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, sign, awning, and installation of ATM machine. Roof mechanical equipment is not to be visible from public space. Submit shop drawings for awnings when ready.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 90-105	4636 Broad Branch Road, N.W. Judith Gelman & Steven Salop Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new fence in rear of property to match existing.

S.L. 90-106	5750 Oregon Avenue, N.W. Jacob & Diana Dweck Residence	1 story front addition - permit
-------------	--	---------------------------------------

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed 1 story addition to front of house. Addition is inappropriate in scale, character and location.

S.L. 90-107	4801 Colorado Avenue, N.W. Karyle Z. Fowler Residence	Sunroom addition and skylight - permit
-------------	---	---

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed sunroom addition and new skylight. Submission is incomplete. Request information including site plan, landscape plan, elevations of new sunroom and location of skylight.

S.L. 90-109	600 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Ocean View Dev. Co. Ltd. Part. First American Bank	Sign - permit
-------------	--	------------------

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement sign.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 90-110	444 North Capitol Street, N.W. First American Bank	Signs - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement signs provided only the logo of the bank is included and the two side signs are omitted.		
S.L. 90-115	301 A Street, S.E.	Alterations and basement
HPA. 90-478	Vestry of St. Mark's Parish St. Mark's Episcopal Church	entrance - conceptual
ACTION: Recommend <u>AGAINST</u> concept of new depressed mechanical equipment area and basement entrance on Third Street, S.E. which are inappropriate to the integrity of this historic structure and the Library of Congress building across from it. Recommend further study for a location other than Third and A Streets.		
S.L. 90-111	5200 27th Street, N.W. Wendall Butler Residence	2 story addition - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 2 story addition.		
S.L. 90-112	1865 Ingleside Terrace, N.W. Fred O'Regan Residence	Fences and rear deck - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed front and rear fences <u>ONLY</u> . Fences are to be painted. Design of deck as proposed is not approved. Request separate submission with re-study of deck.		

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 90-113	480 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W. L'Enfant Plaza Corp. L'Enfant Plaza Hotel	Addition of solarium - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of one story solarium and metal canopy.		
S.L. 90-117 HPA. 90-483	2942 Macomb Street, N.W. Calvert Bowie Residence	Rear addition - conceptual
ACTION: No objection to concept of rear addition as proposed. Submit working drawings for review when ready.		
S.L. 90-98 HPA. 90-439	2942 Macomb Street, N.W. Calvert Bowie Residence	Alterations - permit
ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations including removal of rear porch and addition of front bay window.		

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-77	3015 M Street, N.W.	Rear addition
HPA. 90-328	King George Association Commercial/residential	- revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept design of two-and-one-half story rear addition between the existing carriage house and historic structure overlooking M Street, PROVIDED that basement is limited to the current subsurface footprint. Submit working drawings for review and approval when ready.

O.G. 90-105	2829 O Street, N.W.	Alterations,
HPA. 90-438	Michael Minkoff Residence	landscaping and fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, landscaping and fence as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 April 1990.

O.G. 90-107	1406 30th Street, N.W.	Alterations,
HPA. 90-461	Mary Jean Potter Residence	new masonry wall and gate - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and new garden wall with gate.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-96	1241 28th Street, N.W.	Rebuild
HPA. 90-428	Lillian Volyelson Trust	exterior wall
	Residence	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rebuilding exterior rear wall which is shown to be unsafe. Wall should be painted.

O.G. 90-100	3271 P Street, N.W.	New masonry
HPA. 90-433	John D. Walker	garden wall and
	Residence	repaving
		- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed brick garden wall at building line. Wall is to be no higher than 22 inches. Additions to wall, including iron railings and picket fences, will be submitted under separate application.

O.G. 90-86	1242 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.	Lighting and
HPA. 90-356	MVF Associates	awnings
	Gap Kids	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new awnings with lettering at the valances and gooseneck lamps as overhead illumination.

O.G. 90-87	3015 Orchard Lane, N.W.	Rear addition
HPA. 90-365	John Jacobson	- permit
	Residence	

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed addition which would change the geometry and character of this house and adversely affect its five nearly identical neighbors to the west and the existing pattern of open space in the block.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-88	3017 Orchard Lane, N.W.	Skylights
HPA. 90-366	Ann Polk Residence	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed "flat-profile" skylights at garage and below the rear dormer window.

O.G. 90-84	3237 M Street, N.W.	Security grille
HPA. 90-339	Soleiman Brothers Outer Limits	(existing) - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST security grille as proposed. Recommend submission of shed-type awning in addition to grille in order to conceal grille housing.

O.G. 90-98	1079 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.	Sign/Awning
HPA. 90-431	Germar Properties Nature Food Centers	removal - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the removal of the existing awning and the addition of signs as shown.

O.G. 90-97	3300 M Street, N.W.	Sign
HPA. 90-429	M. Reed Merrill Chase Galleries	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wall-mounted sign consisting of individual letters.

O.G. 90-93	3209 M Street, N.W.	Projecting sign
HPA. 90-419	M Street Associates Hair Cuttery	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed projecting sign mounted over entrance to second floor premises.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-92	3033 O Street, N.W.	Deck and fence
HPA. 90-407	Lois Valliere Residence	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed ground-level deck and continuation of existing fence.

O.G. 90-94	3721 Winfield Lane, N.W.	Iron fence
HPA. 90-424	Sidney Spencer Residence	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed iron fence.

O.G. 90-89	1533 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.	Fence
HPA. 90-379	1533 Wisconsin Ave. Assoc. Traditions	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence provided the new fencing consists of painted vertical boards.

O.G. 90-91	1312 31st Street, N.W.	Fence
HPA. 90-406	Lucy Moorehead Residence	- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence provided the new fencing consists of painted vertical boards. Suggest color be dark green or white.

O.G. 90-85	2821 N Street, N.W.	Alteration and
HPA. 90-350	Maureen Brennan Residence	repair
		- permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-95	1503 35th Street, N.W.	Curb-cut and
HPA. 90-425	Maria Jose Fenwick	off-street
	Residence	parking area
		- permit

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed curb-cut and off-street parking area on the basis of the extensive street frontage of the property and the lack of any connection to an existing alley. Because of the size of the property, the proposed work will have a minimal impact on the character of the existing house and its surrounding landscape.

ADDENDUM

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-102	1406 30th Street, N.W.	New masonry
HPA. 90-436	Mary Jean Potter	wall, altera-
	Residence	tions and gate
		- concept

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by O.G. 90-107.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

PENSION BUILDING
401 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

19 April 1990

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 401 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of project sites.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
 Hon. Neil J. Porterfield, Vice-Chairman
 Hon. Joan Abrahamson
 Hon. Adele Chatfield-Taylor
 Hon. George E. Hartman
 Hon. Robert A. Peck

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
 Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
 Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
 Mrs. Sue Kohler
 Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino

National Capital
Planning Commission
staff present:

Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 15 March 1990 meeting. Mr. Peck suggested that on page 6, under the discussion of the chancery for the German Democratic Republic, the words "withhold approval" be changed to "withhold a decision". The other members agreed this would more accurately reflect the Commission's action, and the minutes will be so amended.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

17 May 1990
21 June 1990

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, United States Mint

CFA 19/APR/90-10, Bicentennial of the United States Coast Guard, medal. Design. Staff member Sue Kohler introduced Eugene Essner, deputy director of the U. S. Mint, to show drawings for this medal. Mr. Essner said the law authorizing the medal had been signed by the President about a month ago, and the Mint had embarked on what might be called a crash program to get the medal designed and struck in time for the ceremony on 4 August. He explained that the Mint could not begin design work on any project until the legislation had been signed into law.

The seal of the Coast Guard was the only design Mr. Essner showed for the reverse of the medal. The members thought it was well done and approved it unanimously. Four designs were shown for the obverse, all based on a painting by Anton Fischer in the Coast Guard's collection, showing Coast Guardsmen in a surf boat, going to the rescue of a ship in distress. There were some variations in the wording of the inscription, in the placement of the words on the medal, and in the lettering style. One version did not show the foundering ship. Mr. Essner said the Commandant of the Coast Guard preferred the design which had the inscription "Guardians of the Sea" placed within a scroll at the top, and "Bicentennial Anniversary" at the bottom, in another scroll held by the talons of an eagle. The members said they preferred the inscription "United States Coast Guard - 200 Years of Service", in simple letters around the edge of the medal, as shown in two of the designs. There was some concern about showing the ship in the background; the Chairman commented that too many elements would make the design confusing when it was reduced to medal size. If the ship were used, it was suggested that it be rendered as simply as possible. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked Mr. Essner if it was unusual to base the design of a medal on a painting; he said it was not, that quite a few designs had been based on either paintings or photographs. Mr. Peck said he would prefer that the waves be rendered without the whitecaps. In general, Mr. Essner was advised to keep the medal as simple as possible; he thanked the members and said he would take their suggestions to the sculptor-engravers at the Mint. Exhibit A

B. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 19/APR/90-1, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, West Potomac Park. Review of approved design. (Previous: CFA 20/SEP/79-15) The Assistant Secretary recalled the Commission's approval of the design in 1979, noting that it was one that had been considerably scaled down from the original version of 1975. He noted that the members had had the opportunity to look at visual material and a history of the design, and had seen the configuration of the design staked out on the site on their pre-

meeting tour. He pointed out the graphic material that had been submitted by the landscape architect, Lawrence Halprin, and then introduced Representative Bill Green, secretary of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Rep. Green said the Memorial Commission had been established in 1955 and had been working ever since to get a suitable memorial erected to the late president. He said construction of the Halprin design had been authorized by law in 1982, but it did not get under way because of budget problems. The National Park Service had not wanted to proceed until Congress had authorized at least \$5 million to begin construction; this money was obtained through the work of the late congressman, Claude Pepper, in 1989. Mr. Green said the Memorial Commission wanted the Commission of Fine Arts to take another look at the design before it went ahead. Architect Lawrence Halprin was then introduced.

Mr. Halprin commented first on drawings prepared by the staff to show the comparative sizes of the major memorials. He did not find them useful because they did not consider that each memorial took advantage of a larger setting in which it was placed: the Lincoln Memorial of the Reflecting Pool, for example, and the Jefferson of the Tidal Basin. Similarly, he said, the Roosevelt Memorial would partake of the setting of the Washington Monument, on axis with the memorial entrance, as well as the Tidal Basin. He talked about the life of FDR, the organization of the memorial into four "rooms", representing the Four Freedoms and the various periods of his life, and then showed a video that described the memorial in more detail.

Mr. Halprin said the memorial was conceived as a landscape solution, with the four granite-walled garden rooms set into a berm; it would stretch about 900 feet along West Potomac Park, near the Tidal Basin. The existing playing fields would remain. The bermed area would be heavily planted with trees, and more trees would be set into the granite paving that would form the floor of the rooms and extend beyond them, providing the circulation along the length of the memorial. Additional plantings would be used in the passages between the rooms. On the walls would be bronze bas-reliefs, and inscriptions carved into the granite, relating to Roosevelt's life and career; there would be widespread use of water, in the form of waterfalls and pools, throughout the memorial, to recall the important part water played in the President's life. The entrance to the memorial would be from the Potomac side, along a wide path lined with trees, on axis with the Washington Monument. The visitor would end his visit to the memorial in an amphitheatre at the Tidal Basin, along the Cherry Walk. Most of the cherry trees and existing elms in the area would remain. In answer to a question, Mr. Halprin said the principal changes made since the design was originally reviewed were the elimination of the interpretive center and the shortening of the memorial by about 200 feet.

The members had a number of questions for Mr. Halprin, most of them related to the great size of the memorial, the large amount of paving, and the change it would bring to the meadow-like character of the area. The Chairman was also concerned about the noise of aircraft, as they approached or took off from nearby National Airport. Mr. Halprin answered by saying that studies had been made showing that the sound from the water elements within the memorial would take care of the aircraft noise problem.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield said he was an admirer of Mr. Halprin's work generally, and liked the way the events in President Roosevelt's life were portrayed in this memorial, but had serious reservations about constructing what would be a great urban development on a lovely meadow between the Potomac and the Tidal Basin, a special site from which the surrounding city could be seen; he thought the development was foreign to the context of the site. He questioned, too, whether FDR would have wanted such a memorial, and if there would be enough money to pay for all of it.

Mr. Peck had similar misgivings. Recognizing that the Commission was dealing with an important memorial and an important site, he said he thought the design concept was wrong; he did not like the way the berming would cut off the view of the Potomac for those looking back from the Tidal Basin, or the way in which the relationship of the two bodies of water would be changed generally.

Mr. Hartman was concerned about the great amount of paving proposed, commenting that there seemed to be as much as in all the other major memorials combined. Mr. Halprin said trees would break into the paved area, softening it; he was reluctant to cut the size of the memorial for fear that it could not then accommodate the anticipated crowds. Mr. Hartman asked Park Service representative John Parsons how many people attended major events on the Mall; he was told that 450,000 was an average figure. Mr. Hartman said he would rather see the memorial overcrowded than underused; he thought Mr. Halprin should work with the Park Service and figure out how much paving was really necessary. Vice-Chairman Porterfield suggested that one way to lessen the effect of the paving would be to have a softer edge where the paving met the grass on the Tidal Basin side. The Chairman said he, too, was nervous about the paving. He thought that in the midsummer sun, the relentless quality of the granite would make itself felt, especially as both walls and pavement would be of the same material. He suggested using packed earth, seen frequently in France in similar areas, but Mr. Halprin did not think it would be acceptable in this situation. Ms. Abrahamson asked if the pavement would appear as red as it seemed in the graphic material; Mr. Halprin said it would not and showed her samples of the granite he had chosen.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said it was the granite walls that concerned her most. Mr. Halprin said they would be only 10 feet high (the drawing of record indicate one actual height of 14 feet) and would frequently have sculpture or inscriptions on them, as well as being interspersed with waterfalls and plant material. She asked him if he would have designed the memorial in the same way if he had started just a year ago; he said that was a hard question to answer, that he still believed in the basic principles although he might have come up with different forms. He was also asked how he would reduce the size of the memorial if the budget demanded it; he said he did not have an answer to that question at the time, but hoped it would not be necessary because he felt it was just right the way it was.

Ms. Frances Campbell, from the FDR Memorial Foundation, asked to comment. She said the late congressman, Claude Pepper, who had been a close friend of the late President's, thought the memorial was most appropriate, especially because of its historical aspects. She said the Roosevelt family also considered it appropriate. Mr. Halprin commented that the form of a memorial was not up to the person memorialized, but to those who wanted to remember him.

The Chairman said the Commission did not want to hold things up, but had been asked by the Congress to comment again on the design, and it was evident that there was a unanimous concern about the size and grandiosity of the scheme. He said there were many positive things about the design that he would not want to see destroyed, but thought it should be looked at again in the terms of the 1990s. Mr. Halprin said he had no problem with that, and would restudy the design with the members' comments in mind, especially with a view to giving it a softer, more gardenesque quality. The Chairman thanked him for his presentation, and Mr. Halprin said he would return in two or three months with new studies. Exhibit B

2. CFA 19/APR/90-2, Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Memorial to honor women of the U. S. Armed Forces who served in Vietnam. Site selection. (Previous: CFA 22/OCT/87-1.) Staff member Sue Kohler noted the members' visit to the site just before the meeting, and then gave a brief summary of the previous submission for the benefit of those who had not been members at the time. She said that in October 1987 the Commission had reviewed a proposal to place a statue of an army nurse at the Vietnam Memorial, in a grove of trees near the path at the south east end of the memorial site. At the time, the members were reluctant to approve any additions to the memorial, which they considered complete. It was observed that a delicate balance had been achieved, not without great difficulty, when the statues of the three foot-soldiers had been added.

A second concern was that the site selected, although not detrimental to the existing elements, was somewhat remote and gave the statue the appearance of an after-thought, a secondary element, that would not accomplish the goal its sponsors had in mind.

A third question concerned the authority to add the statue: Could it be added under the legislation that had authorized the original memorial, or did it require new legislation, which would follow the procedures required by the Commemorative Works Act? It was thought that the sponsors should get their own legislation, and they were encouraged in this direction by Rep. Mary Rose Oakar, then chairman of the House Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials. Mrs. Kohler said legislation authorizing the memorial was signed into law in November 1988; a year later, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, a joint resolution of the Congress authorized the location of the memorial in Area I. In neither case was the legislation site-specific, but each bill noted that: "It is the sense of the Congress that it would be most fitting and appropriate to place the memorial within the 2.2 acre site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial."

Mrs. Kohler then introduced David Sherman from the Park Service to begin the presentation. Mr. Sherman said the Memorial Advisory Committee had reviewed a number of sites for the memorial and had preferred what was called Site 2, near the location chosen in 1987, although the door was left open to other possibilities, should the winner of the design competition prefer an alternate. He then introduced Diane Evans, head of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project, to continue the discussion. Ms. Evans said she had served in Vietnam as an Army nurse and had been working to make this project a reality since 1984. She thanked the Commission for giving her the opportunity to present it, and said she would make further remarks after the various site possibilities had been presented by Suzette Voline, from the architectural firm of Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum.

Ms. Voline said her firm's study had two goals in mind: to find a site relevant to its historic context, and one that would not impact any existing memorials. She showed site diagrams, pointing out five areas that had been considered, and the sites looked at within each area. Area A was located to the north of the Wall, between Henry Bacon Drive and Constitution Avenue. She said it had been eliminated because anything placed there would be intrusive on the visitor's experience of the Wall; another concern was the traffic noise from Constitution Avenue. Area B was the central area of the memorial, including the upper terrace of lawn north of the Wall and the larger lawn area in front of it; anything placed in this area would be considered intrusive. Area C consisted of the cone-shaped view sheds from the apex of the Walls towards the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument; again, these were considered areas that should not be built upon. Area D was the area adjacent to the entry plaza; as such, it was

considered to be in the "shadow" of the Hart statue and unsuitable for any development. Area E, on both sides of the southern perimeter path and on the west side of the path coming from the Lincoln Memorial, offered the best opportunity for sites that would relate to, but would not be intrusive on, the existing memorial elements.

Ms. Voline then discussed six sites within Areas A and E. She said the two sites in Area A (sites 5 & 6) were not recommended because of the noise and intrusion aspects previously mentioned. Site 3, in Area E, was considered too close to the Hart statue and presented pedestrian circulation problems. Site 4, along the path coming from the Lincoln Memorial, had the disadvantage of setting up a linear sequence of events in this area, which was already congested with people stopping at the flagpole, the Hart statue, then back to the directories and the beginning of the Wall. She said the two most promising sites were 1 & 2, both located near the path that led to the Hart statue and entry plaza or to Constitution Gardens. Site 1 was located on the north side of the path, in a grove of trees; site 2 was south of the path. Both would offer views of the Wall through the trees, a new way to experience it, but at the same time, the trees would screen the women's memorial so that it would not intrude on either the Wall or the Hart statue. Ms. Voline said it was expected that the memorial would be set in a round plaza and would be about the same size as the Hart statue and its setting. She said the Park Service had informed them that the path could be moved slightly if necessary to accommodate a memorial on either Site 1 or Site 2.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked if the memorial would line up with the apex of the Wall. Ms. Voline said it would be approximately in that position but not rigidly aligned. The Chairman thought it very important that it not be aligned; he recounted the difficulty experienced previously in persuading the proponents of the flag and statue additions that placing these elements on direct axis with the apex, in full view of the Wall, would be severely damaging to both the Wall and the additions. Ms. Abrahamson said that after having seen the site, she was more comfortable with Site 2 than she had been before. Ms. Voline said that although the Memorial Advisory Commission had expressed a preference for Site 2, her firm would like to keep the option of going with either Site 1 or Site 2, because they would not know what the design would be until after the competition. Mr. Sherman said the Advisory Commission had taken the same position and left the door open to allow for more creativity. Ms. Abrahamson said she was pleased to hear that, because she would not like to throw out a wonderful design because it had been conceived for one of the other sites.

Ms. Evans continued the presentation, filling the members in on what had happened since the 1987 submission--the passage of the legislation, the creation of a board of directors, investigations into site selection, and preliminary work on the design

competition. She talked about the role of women during the Vietnam War, their healing role, their work behind the scenes and off the record. She said that, like the men, they needed to heal and to receive recognition, something not provided in the existing Vietnam Memorial, therefore leaving it fundamentally incomplete. She reaffirmed that the preferred memorial element remained a figurative statue of a woman, although the competition, judged by a jury of eminent architects, artists, and veterans, would not be closed to other design solutions. She said the figure should relate to the Hart statue in material, style and scale. Ms. Evans recalled the resolve with which Jan Scruggs had pursued his goal to build the original memorial, and said her group had been promised financial support from the major veterans' organizations and had received tens of thousands of private gifts. She closed by quoting from a letter received from a woman in Canada, who said: "While I do not wish to celebrate war, I do wish to see the story of women's involvement with it told with accuracy, dignity, and honor, just as we do that of the men."

The members had several questions. Mr. Peck asked Mr. Sherman if he were aware of any other proposals for memorials to Vietnam veterans in the area or elsewhere. Mr. Sherman said there had been several proposals for other additions to Maya Lin's memorial; one of them, for a flagpole at the apex, had gotten as far as proposed legislation. Ms. Evans commented that the legislation authorizing the women's memorial stated the memorial would be complete with that addition. Mr. Peck said one Congress could undo what another had done, and he thought the site for the women's memorial should be chosen with the thought in mind that sites for other additions might have to be found in the future; he thought the Commission should give a clear indication of its preference in this case. His second comment was that he was disappointed that there was such strong support for the use of figurative sculpture, not because he was against it, but because he thought it would put a constraint on the artists in the competition. Mr. Sherman commented on the question of site selection; he said the only reason the Memorial Advisory Commission had not made a clear-cut decision was that the nature of the design was still unknown, adding that the Advisory Commission would be reviewing the design criteria for the competition.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked what kind of competition Ms. Evans had in mind, and who would be paying for the memorial. She was told there would be an open competition, one stage, or possibly two, and that funds would be raised privately, not provided by the government. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she shared Mr. Peck's views on putting any constraint on the artists in regard to the type of design solution that would be acceptable.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield agreed that a strong statement on figurative sculpture would discourage some artists. He also warned about the problems of trying to represent all women who served in

Vietnam with one figure; he said someone would always feel left out. Ms. Evans said she thought that as Frederick Hart's statue represented all men, the women's statue would represent all women, and she thought that challenge could be met.

Ms. Abrahamson said she detected a bit of competitive feeling, on the part of the women's group, with the Hart statue and the Wall; she thought they would achieve better results if they concentrated on how to produce the strongest, most meaningful memorial, one that was integrated with the other elements and did not become a separate precinct for women. In regard to the site, she said she thought not enough had been said about the one near the flagpole, on the path from the Lincoln Memorial. She thought it would have great impact as an entry experience, would be well-related to the other elements, and not seen as peripheral. Ms. Evans said they definitely did not want to be seen as competitive, but Ms. Abrahamson thought that in the desire not to be, there was the danger that a feeling of separateness would creep in.

Ms. Evans said she would like to comment on the image and feeling they wanted to create with this memorial. She observed that veterans and others who visited the Wall for the first time often left in a highly emotional state and needed some place to sit and regain their composure. She hoped that the women's memorial could meet that need, continuing the healing process provided by the women who served during the war. Vice-Chairman Porterfield commented that what she was describing was a place rather than a monument, a place where all these feelings would be brought together in a finale to the experience of war.

The Chairman thought that from the discussion a resolution could be framed in terms of recommending Site 2, but not precluding another site, particularly Site 4, near the entry. Mr. Hartman said he would second that, but would add that Site 2 should be interpreted as encompassing the path, which could be moved or reworked to accommodate the design. There was unanimous agreement that this was the sense of the Commission. Exhibit C

Mr. Peck took the opportunity of the Park Service's presence to ask about the unsightly appearance of the black standards and chains in the area of the Hart statue, erected to channel the crowds. Mr. Sherman said, and the Secretary agreed, that they had been erected with the approval of the Commission. The Chairman said he thought the problem was that they did not seat well, and as the posts leaned, the chains assumed varying catenaries that gave an uneven, messy appearance. Mr. Peck said the posts themselves had not been well-maintained. Mr. Sherman said the problem was that they had been put in as a temporary measure, with the expectation that they would be removed when the extraordinary number of visitors dropped-off, but he would take a look at them and see what could be done. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor suggested that a natural barrier, such as bramble bushes, might be considered.

(The Commission recessed for lunch at 1:20 p.m. and reconvened at 1:50 p.m.)

3. CFA 19/APR/90-11, Proposed sculpture, Res. 58, 21st Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. David Sherman from the Park Service introduced this submission by recalling the International Sculpture Exhibition held in Washington about ten years ago and saying that another one was planned for June 1990. He said they anticipated several requests for temporary placement of sculpture around the city; the pieces would go up around 1 June and remain for three weeks. Mr. Sherman said he would like to come to the next meeting and talk about the whole issue of temporary sculpture on park land; in the meantime, the first request for an installation for the sculpture exhibition had been received, from sculptor Wendy Ross, to place a 16-foot-high figural sculpture on Reservation 58, across from the Phillips Gallery.

The Chairman said he was all in favor of another sculpture exhibition and hoped it would recur on a regular basis. Since the installations would be for only three weeks, he did not think it was necessary for the Commission to review every individual piece and site; he said he would rather not consider separately Ms. Ross's piece for Reservation 58, but instead, with the concurrence of the other members, simply report that the Commission endorsed the concept of the International Sculpture Exhibition and the temporary display of sculpture on park land. The members unanimously concurred. Mr. Sherman said the Park Service had made the submission on the basis of the Commission's long-standing review of temporary sculpture exhibits by the Federal Reserve on park land near their buildings. The Chairman thought that was a different situation because their sculpture was in place for a much longer period of time. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she would like to hear from the Park Service on the whole question of temporary installation of sculpture at a future meeting; the other members agreed. Exhibit D

C. Department of the Air Force
CFA 19/APR/90-3, Bolling Air Force Base. Repair and alterations to the Potomac River embankment. Review of this submission was postponed until the next meeting.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix 1. Approved.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 90-103, 3301 K Street, N.W. Proposed residential-commercial office complex. Revised concept design. (The Chairman recused himself from consideration of this project and turned the meeting over to Vice-Chairman Porterfield.) Mr. Carson recalled that this was the second time the Commission had looked at a concept design for this site. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed it four times, beginning in July 1989, when it was a two-phase scheme with both office and residential sections, containing about 151,000 square feet, not including the PEPCO substation on the site. Subsequently, reductions in size and changes in configuration had been made, and when the Commission saw it in February, it was a single phase project with no residential, a square footage of approximately 85,000, and considerable open space to the west, which had concerned the Commission because it left open the possibility of another building on that land. He read the Commission's recommendation, which was to reduce the apparent height and bulk, especially as viewed from the northeast along the C & O Canal, redistribute the mass and forego any additional structures on the site, provide more articulation on the K Street facade, and incorporate some residential units. He said the architects had restudied the project in light of these recommendations, and were ready to present a single phase residential/office complex of 101,500 square feet, spread out over most of the site, a reduction by one-third of what had originally been presented. He introduced architect Dale Ciapetti to discuss the changes that had been made.

Using a model and drawings, Mr. Ciapetti pointed out that one floor had been removed from the office section, bringing the height along K Street down from 98 to 70 feet. The mass of this section had been reduced from 79,000 to 68,000 square feet and pulled back further from the canal. A more varied outline had made the small residential section to the west less harsh and abrupt in appearance. On 33rd Street the building had been opened up more through the use of setbacks, and the plaza turnaround had been redesigned so that it was more in keeping with the warehouse and industrial character of the old waterfront. In addition to the 33rd Street drop-off, there would be one on K Street, accomplished through a reconfiguration of the sidewalk.

In answer to a question from Mr. Peck, Mr. Carson said the Georgetown Board had given its approval to the overall massing and general architectural character, although a reduction in height of the tower on the residential component was suggested, as was a restudy of the turnaround, which did not appear to provide adequate space. (The Board had not seen the design for the turnaround just shown to the Commission.) Mr. Peck asked why the Commission should be concerned with traffic considerations. Vice-Chairman Porterfield said they frequently had aesthetic implications, and Mr. Carson added that if such problems were not properly worked out

in the design stage, an unsightly stop-gap solution might have to be resorted to later on. Mr. Peck said his concern was that review boards sometimes get involved in aspects of a project they know nothing about.

Mr. Carson then noted the receipt of letters from both the ANC and the Citizens Association of Georgetown, expressing their disapproval of this project. A resident of the neighboring Flour Mill project commented on the traffic and turnaround situation on this dead-end section of 33rd Street and said that it had to be addressed. There was more discussion of this matter with the architect, and it was agreed that he would return to the Old Georgetown Board with further study of the 33rd Street drop-off and turnaround; the Vice-Chairman added that he would like to have another look at the landscaping. Other than these requests, the Commission supported the Georgetown Board's recommendation and approved the overall massing and general architectural character.

Exhibit E

b. Appendix II. The Secretary called the members' attention to one item on the appendix, O.G. 90-95, 1503 35th Street, N.W., reporting that the Georgetown Board had not been in agreement on the width of the parking space that should be allowed-for one car or two; the width of the curb-cut would remain the same. Mr. Martinez showed drawings of both versions, and the Secretary said the architect would like it to be somewhere in the middle. The members did not think it made much difference and agreed to approve whichever solution was satisfactory to those involved. The rest of Appendix II was approved.

E. Department of State, International Center

CFA 19/APR/90-4, Egyptian Embassy. Preliminary design for new chancery. Review of this submission was postponed until the next meeting.

F. Department of the Army, Military District of Washington, Fort Myer

CFA 19/APR/90-5, Six NCO family housing units. New Constructio, Fort Myer, Virginia. Revised design and site development. (Previous: CFA 18/JAN/90-5.) The Assistant Secretary recalled the Commission's previous disapproval of the siting of these houses, because of their location in a buffer zone between Fort Myer and Arlington Cemetery; he noted that the members had made a second site inspection, prior to this meeting, and had viewed a revised siting, staked out. He said the houses would be semi-detached brick row houses; the brick would be compatible with that used in the area. He noted that during the previous review there was no objection to the design of the houses. He showed a large-scale rendering of the entire Post, pointing out that parts of the area near the cemetery were marked "Restricted" on the

master plan. Mr. Myer then introduced Jack Webb, master planner for Fort Myer, to discuss the revised siting and answer the members' questions.

Mr. Webb said the houses had been moved closer to the road to reduce the amount of grading and loss of trees. He said they would form a small cluster in a residential area, surrounded by recreational land, and that no further development was planned for the site. There were some questions about the parking area, which he described as well-screened with trees. Vice-Chairman Porterfield said that no matter how few houses there were, or how they were designed, they would tend to usurp the whole space; he said he did not think housing was the proper use for that site. Mr. Hartman agreed; he thought the new siting was better than the original, but still not acceptable. He thought the only possibility of placing the houses in the area was to put them next to the existing houses and leave the treed space alone, but he was not optimistic that it could be done. Mr. Peck said another reason for not siting the houses as proposed was the proximity to the cemetery chapel, and the need to close off the road during funerals. Mr. Webb said the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office had approved the new siting, and the Advisory Council also thought it was a great improvement. He said he did not like the site, personally, but the Army had a real problem in trying to find a suitable place for this housing. The Chairman said he did not think the new siting had convinced the Commission to change its basic feeling that this was not an appropriate location for housing. The other members agreed and the submission was again disapproved. Exhibit F

At this time, Kara Kent, representing the Georgetown ANC, asked to make a statement on an administrative point relating to the Old Georgetown project at 3301 K Street; she said she had not been able to get to the meeting in time to make her statement during the discussion of that project. She said the ANC's comments had not been included in the Old Georgetown Board's report to the Commission on the project, and she had not been able to get a copy of the report in time to comment at this meeting, although the Secretary did read the report to her over the phone. She said she hoped arrangements could be made so that the ANC would receive the Board's reports before the Commission's meetings, as had been agreed to last year.

Mr. Atherton said the Board members had not approved the report until the day before the Commission meeting; therefore, he could not give Ms. Kent an official copy at the time she requested it, although he did read the draft to her on the telephone. Mr. Peck asked when the Board had met on this project; Mr. Atherton said it had been two weeks ago, and in response to Mr. Peck's further question as to whether it normally took that long to get the reports approved, Mr. Atherton said it did. Mr. Peck thought every effort ought to be made to get reports to the public in time

for their comments. Ms. Kent said this was actually one of the very few times this had happened, and Mr. Atherton observed that the Board's actions took place in a public meeting, so it was not as though the public was prohibited from knowing what took place. In answer to a question from Ms. Abrahamson, he said the Commission's review could not be postponed in a case like this, because the statute of limitations would run out (45 days) and the D. C. Permits Office could assume the Commission had no objections.

G. Department of Agriculture

CFA 19/APR/90-6, Child Development Center playground, Auditors Building, 14th Street & Independence Avenue, N.W. Design. This submission was postponed until the next meeting.

(The agenda order was changed and item "I" discussed next.)

I. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 19/APR/90-8, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W. Wall mural. Concept design. (The Chairman recused himself from consideration of this project and turned the gavel over to Vice-Chairman Porterfield.) The artist, Mame Cohalan, was introduced to show the members several similar design sketches for this mural, to be painted on the west party wall of the building at 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W. She said the sponsor of the mural was the Oliver Carr Company, and both the Carr Company and the PADC design board had reviewed the sketches and made comments. She said the design was historically referenced, in some details generic and in others specific, and she wanted it to be in scale with the wall itself and become a part of what was already there--particularly the monumental, columned buildings at Market Square and the Archives building across the street. The design was based on a triumphal arch motif, with the sky visible through the arch, thus taking the viewer through and beyond the architecture. She showed several versions, commenting on the reactions of the Carr Company and the PADC design board. The two preferred by the Carr Company were acceptable to the Commission, and there was agreement that the one preferred by PADC was probably the best if the top part of the arch were lightened somewhat. It was suggested to Ms. Cohalan that she revise it in the direction of the comments she had received and send the Commission a copy of her final drawing. Exhibit G

H. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park

CFA 19/APR/90-7, Amazonia/Aquatic Habitats Exhibit. Final design. (Previous: CFA 16/JUN/88-3, CFA 21/SEP/89-2.) (The Chairman returned and assumed the gavel.) The Secretary said the staff had reviewed the working drawings and found they conformed to the approved concept drawings. For those new members not familiar with the project, he made reference to a model in the room, noting that the building had taken its shape from a polar

bear exhibit, formerly on the site. He said the large roof enclosure was similar to other buildings in the zoo, particularly bird exhibits; this one would house a tropical rainforest and would make it possible for the visitor to see both below and above the water level. He said it was part of the director's effort to turn the zoo into an ecologic park, rather than just place animals on display. Mr. Carson said the colors on the interior would be cool greens and blues; the exterior precast concrete walls would be in the warmer tones now characteristic of the zoo buildings. There were no objections and the final drawings and materials were unanimously approved. Exhibit H

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m., and the members left for the Freer Gallery.

J. Freer Gallery

CFA 19/APR/90-9, tour of Freer Gallery. The members were met by the director of the gallery and given a tour and status report on the Freer renovations. They also visited the Peacock Room and listened to the conservator describe the cleaning and restoration then in progress.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT A

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission was happy to meet with Mr. Eugene Essner at its 19 April meeting to discuss designs for the medal commemorating the bicentennial of the United States Coast Guard.

The design of the reverse, depicting the Coast Guard seal, was approved. For the obverse, the Commission liked the elements of several of the four similar designs shown. It was recommended that the inscription read: "United States Coast Guard - 200 Years of Service", that it be placed around the edge of the medal, as shown in two of the designs, and that a simple style of lettering be used without scrolls. The use of the surf boat was approved as the central element. The depiction of the ship in distress in the background was considered optional; if used, it should be rendered as simply as possible, so that the design does not become confusing and weakened when reduced to medal size. It was also recommended that the waves be rendered without whitecaps.

Should questions arise, the staff would be happy to provide assistance.

Sincerely,



J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
United States Mint
633 3rd Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT B

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

9 May 1990

Dear Senators Hatfield and Inouye:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the design for the FDR Memorial at its meeting on 19 April 1990. This action came about as a result of the 1990 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation legislation, which stated in the conference report that "the managers agree that the Commission (The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission) should receive a final review of memorial plans by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to the Park Service obligating funds for memorial construction." The design, as a matter of record, was initially approved by this commission on 20 September 1979, and was subsequently designated in the 1982 legislation authorizing the FDR memorial.

As part of its deliberations, the commission asked the National Park Service to stake out the actual configuration of the memorial on the site. They did, and we found the ensuing inspection extremely valuable. We also asked to have Larry Halprin, the designer, attend the meeting so the members could have the benefit of his personal presentation and first-hand responses to their questions.

At the meeting, there was concern voiced over the extremely large scale of the design. In addition, questions arose about the extensive openness of the space, the interruption of views of the Potomac River, the lack of sufficient shade, and the large areas of granite paving.

Mr. Halprin replied that he felt the current configuration was still valid. He said, however, that as such a long period had elapsed since he had actually conceived the design, he would welcome the opportunity to go back and take another look, bearing in mind the concerns he was hearing expressed. It was his feeling it would be worth the effort, something he had estimated would take about 6 to 8 weeks to accomplish. That would mean sometime around the first half of summer we should be meeting again.

In the meantime, we will be happy to do anything we can to facilitate this process should the occasion arise, and we will keep you advised of the schedule.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Carter Brown", with a stylized, flowing script.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Senators Mark O. Hatfield & Daniel K. Inouye
H2-347 House Annex 2
Washington, D.C. 20516

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT C

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission was happy to meet with David Sherman from the Park Service, and representatives from the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project and the architectural firm of Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum, to consider possible sites for the Vietnam Women's Memorial within the Vietnam Memorial precinct.

A final site selection at this time is difficult, since the design elements are not yet known, but after making a site inspection and listening to the comments of those involved with the project, the Commission thought that Site No. 2, southeast of the grove of trees across from and south of the existing path, was the most advantageous of the several presented. Site No. 1, in the same area, was also considered a possibility, as was site No. 4, at the western edge of the memorial, along the path coming from the Lincoln Memorial. It was understood, in discussing Sites Nos. 1 and 2, that the path between the two sites could be slightly altered to accommodate the selected design.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing plans for the memorial after the winner of the design competition has been announced. The Commission requests that the program and prospectus for the design competition be submitted for its information in draft form at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,



J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT D

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Mr. Stanton:

At its meeting on 19 April 1990, the Commission of Fine Arts met with John Parsons of your staff to discuss a couple of matters involving the temporary display of sculpture on park land.

The first is a specific proposal to install a work by artist Wendy Ross on Reservation 58, a site bordered by Massachusetts Avenue, Q Street, and 21st Street just south of the Phillips Gallery. The piece, entitled "Reverence", is in epoxy and approximately 16 feet high. The Commission without any specific consideration of the merits or demerits of this piece had no objection to the installation on a temporary (3 week) basis in conjunction with the "International Sculpture 90 Exhibition" scheduled for some time in early June.

The Commission endorsed this event as helpful to Washington in generating an awareness of outdoor sculpture. It would have no objection to pieces associated with the show being placed on park land for a period of only three weeks. We do not feel it appropriate to review each and every piece, per se. On the other hand, if there is a particular situation the Park Service is troubled by, the staff would be happy to work with your office and if need be, the Commission itself might of course be consulted, although they might wish to stand by their generic approval.

Sincerely,



J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

19 April 1990

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 90-103	3301 K Street, N.W.	New building -
HPA. 90-437	Potomac Capital Invest. Corp. Office residential	revised concept

ACTION: General architectural character for single phase office/residential development is acceptable. Suggest reduction in height of residential component, if possible. Recommend careful study of "drop-off" at 33rd Street next to C & O Canal to avoid potentially serious traffic problem; current space provided does not appear adequate for turn-around. Submit working drawings and material samples for review when ready.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT F

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Mr. Kennon:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on 19 April 1990 had the opportunity to review revised plans for the six NCO housing units at Fort Myer proposed for a hillside site next to Arlington Cemetery.

As you know, the Commission expressed serious reservation about this proposal the first time it was presented. Now as then, our concern continues to be not with the design, per se, but with the choice of site. For some time this land has been considered part of a buffer zone that was established to protect Arlington National Cemetery from the encroachment of development at Fort Myer. It still is carried on the base master plan as such.

Our second visit to the site and subsequent discussions at the meeting re-confirmed the belief that the masterplan is still valid and that this land should remain open and not built upon. Certainly there must be other areas on the base where this housing could be located. In fact, a site just up the hill along the adjoining roadways might do very well. There most likely are others as well.

We recognize the need to increase housing units on the base. At the same time we are obligated to see that this kind of ad hoc "planning" does not become the basis for future development, especially when, as in this instance, proposed projects threaten to affect adversely existing and more valuable resources.

Consequently, we strongly urge that further efforts to move this housing forward be directed toward finding another site. Our staff will be happy to assist in any way it can toward achieving this end.

Finally, I would like to thank representatives of this project for staking out the location on the site for our inspection. We found it most useful and appreciate the effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'J. Carter Brown', written in a cursive style.

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Herbert H. Kennon
Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT G

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Mr. Hauser:

During its meeting of 19 April 1990, the Commission met with artist Mame Cohalan to discuss concept designs for a proposed mural on the west party wall of 633 Indiana Avenue. The members believe that the endeavor has great merit and encourage development of the original arch motif that was also shown to the members informally at an earlier meeting. There was some discussion regarding the possible "lightening" of the large mass over the arch, but we believe the design is basically sound and any decision to make further adjustments should be the artist's.

Sincerely,



Neil Porterfield
Vice Chairman

Mr. Richard Hauser
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
Suite 1220 North
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-9091

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building
401 F Street, N.W., Suite 312
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT H

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

4 May 1990

Dear Dr. Robinson:

During its meeting of 19 April 1990, the Commission reviewed the final working drawings and material samples for Phase I of the proposed Amazonia/Aquatic Habitats Exhibit on the site of the old polar bear display. The concept approval given last September was enthusiastically confirmed. Regrettably, an overburdened agenda prevented the members from spending as much time on the project as this notable addition to the Zoological Park deserved.

At some point in the near future, when Kent Cooper has the working drawings for Phase II in hand, the Commission, especially our new members, will be happy to meet with you to discuss both the current project as well as your long-range goals for the park.

Sincerely,



J. Carter Brown

Dr. Michael H. Robinson, Director
National Zoological Park
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20008

